

5. Defendant EOS CCA (“EOS”), is a Massachusetts business entity with an address of 700 Longwater Drive, Norwell, Massachusetts 02061, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

6. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by EOS and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. EOS at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

8. The Plaintiff incurred a financial obligation (the “Debt”) to a creditor (the “Creditor”) regarding a personal cellular phone account.

9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to EOS for collection, or EOS was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. EOS Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

12. The Defendants contacted the Plaintiff for collection of the Debt.

13. The Defendants telephoned the Plaintiff more than twice a week.

14. The Defendants placed automated recordings to the Plaintiff.

15. The Defendants placed calls to the Plaintiff from unknown telephone numbers.

16. The Defendants failed to recite the mini-Miranda warning to the Plaintiff.

17. The Defendants used rude and abusive language while speaking to the Plaintiff.

18. The Defendants told the Plaintiff to borrow money from anyone that she could in order to satisfy payment of the Debt.

19. During one conversation, the Defendants demanded that the Plaintiff provide them with her debit card account number. In fact, the Defendants threatened that they would lower the Plaintiff's credit score if she did not provide the requested information.

20. The Defendants demanded that the Plaintiff make a payment of four hundred dollars. The Plaintiff informed the Defendants that she was unable to pay such a large sum, and suggested a lesser amount. The Defendant representative replied that she had no sympathy for her and if she did not pay four hundred dollars, the Defendants would then consider this as a refusal to pay.

21. In her conversations, the Plaintiff agreed for the Defendants to debit a specific, monthly payment. The Defendants however, attempted to make four withdrawals within one month. The Plaintiff has since closed such account.

22. The Defendants did not disclose the identity of the debt collection company during all telephone communications.

23. Furthermore, during telephone conversations, the Defendants would be placed on hold, and moments later, the call would be disconnected.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

24. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.

25. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

26. The Defendants' conduct was so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

27. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

28. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(2) in that Defendants used profane and abusive language when speaking with the consumer.

29. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.

30. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(6) in that Defendants placed calls to the Plaintiff without disclosing the identity of the debt collection agency.

31. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(8) in that Defendants threatened to communicate false credit information.

32. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) in that Defendants employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt.

33. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f(1) in that Defendants attempted to collect an amount not authorized by the agreement creating the Debt.

34. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

35. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

COUNT II
VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT –
47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.

36. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

37. Without prior consent the Defendants made telephone calls to the Plaintiff's residential telephone line using an artificial or prerecorded voice to deliver a message without the prior express consent of the Plaintiff in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B).

38. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

39. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of the Defendants' violations.

COUNT III
INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION

40. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

41. The Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, "One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person."

42. Massachusetts further recognizes the Plaintiff's right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus Defendant violated Massachusetts state law.

43. The Defendant intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff's right to privacy by continually harassing the Plaintiff with telephone calls.

44. The telephone calls made by Defendant to the Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered, "hounding the plaintiff," and, "a substantial burden to her existence," thus satisfying the Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) requirement for an invasion of privacy.

45. The conduct of the Defendant in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

46. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from Defendant.

47. All acts of Defendant and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendant is subject to punitive damages.

COUNT IV
INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

48. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein at length.

49. The acts, practices and conduct engaged in by the Defendants vis-à-vis the Plaintiff was so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community.

50. The foregoing conduct constitutes the tort of intentional infliction of emotional distress under the laws of the State of Massachusetts.

51. All acts of Defendants and the Collectors complained of herein were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendants are subject to imposition of punitive damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against Defendants;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for each violation pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against Defendants;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against Defendants;
4. Statutory damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) & (C);
5. Actual damages from Defendants for the all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
6. Punitive damages; and
7. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: June 1, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Sergei Lemberg

Sergei Lemberg, Esq. (BBO# 650671)
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (877) 795-3666
Attorneys for Plaintiff